

to know the President's rationale for continuing or cutting off aid to a country, and also to facilitate an independent appraisal of the President's actions by Congress.

My amendment would also require the President to report any action taken pursuant to paragraph (3) of subsection 620 (v). That provision allows the President to continue or resume aid to countries which either first, take appropriate measures to halt drug trafficking after an earlier determination by the President that such measures have not been taken by such countries, or second, require assistance from the United States because of "overriding national interest," even though appropriate steps to combat drug trafficking have not been taken.

In my opinion the overriding national interest must be grave indeed to excuse a country from taking steps to eliminate drug traffic to the United States or its citizens, and I would expect the fullest justification for any presidential determination to continue aid which is based on overriding national interest.

Except for the absence of a Presidential reporting requirement, I am, I repeat, pleased with the international drug control provisions included in H.R. 9910 by the Committee on Foreign Relations. I hope that the chairman and members of that committee support this amendment, and that the Senate accept it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I have discussed this matter with the Senator from West Virginia. The substantive provision relating to drug traffic, as he rightly says, is in the bill. As far as I know, it is non-controversial and no one is against it. I think he is thoughtful and wise in providing that the President report to the Congress. I certainly would accept the amendment. I think the President certainly would have no objection, and probably would welcome this opportunity to report to Congress.

I accept the amendment.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I am grateful to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, New York is having probably the biggest problem in the country in this area—not only that, but drug traffic is probably the greatest problem New York has ever had—I am very anxious to work at this end to try to damp the flow. There are three elements to damping the flow: First, the illegality of the crime in pushing and wholesaling drugs; second, rehabilitating drug addicts and trying to eliminate the problem; and third, keeping the addict from engaging in crime.

I am glad the chairman of the committee has accepted the amendment. I think the Senator has rendered us all a service in keeping the administration's feet to the fire in a proposition as critical as this one.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I appreciate the comments of the Senator from New York. I know he has given much attention to the problem and has intense interest in stopping the illegal traffic in drugs.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time on the amendment having been yielded back, the question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I understood the Senator from Idaho (Mr. Church) to say he expected the Senator from Missouri to proceed. Or am I in error about that?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Go ahead.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri is recognized.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, my perfecting amendment, as printed and as it appears in the Record, contains a printing error which I would correct at this time.

The amount to be inserted in lieu of \$250 million in lines 14 and 20 of page 44 should be \$341 million in each instance.

I send a corrected copy of the amendment to the desk, and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment, as modified, will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 44, line 14, strike out "\$250,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$341,000,000".

On page 44, line 20, strike out "\$250,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$341,000,000".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state that there are 9 minutes remaining to each side on this amendment. Who yields time?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my perfecting amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. How much time remains on the perfecting amendment of the Senator from Missouri?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Nine minutes on each side. Who yields time?

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. GRIFFIN. To whom is the time allotted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. To the Senator from Missouri and the Senator from Arkansas. Who yields time?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Time is running on both sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If no one yields time, time will run against both sides.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 minutes for the purpose of an inquiry. The Senator from Missouri is now offering a perfecting amendment to increase the amount of the ceiling for money to Cambodia from \$250 million to what figure?

Mr. SYMINGTON. The sum of \$341 million is the amount requested by the

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct. I have already stated that I think this is

much too much money, and there is no point in my reiterating it.

It was my understanding—and the only excuse I can offer why the Senator from Alaska is not here is that there has been a change of signals—that the Allott-Church amendment was coming up. Now the Senator from Alaska wishes to present a substitute, I believe, or an amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Missouri, and I understand it would be in order. He wishes, I believe, to strike it out—to strike out aid to Cambodia. I believe it has been at the desk. I think he ought to have an opportunity to present it, but there is a change of signals here at the last minute. I did not know it was going to come up just now, because I thought the Church-Allott amendment would be next in line.

But I wonder if the Senator from Missouri would be willing, if he has any further remarks to make, to make those remarks now. If not, I am perfectly willing, after a reasonable opportunity to reach the Senator from Alaska, to proceed to a vote.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am glad to yield to the able Senator.

Mr. AIKEN. I support the move of the Senator from Missouri for increasing the available amount for Cambodia, because I feel that we have a very great responsibility for the pathetic condition of that country today. And while I would not want to see this money spent for raising an army and putting men to war against their neighbors, I feel that if this amount of \$341 million is agreed to at this time, it undoubtedly will not survive the conference at that full amount, though it might, but I doubt in any case if it would survive in the Appropriations Committee; so we are not spending this \$341 million, we are simply making it available to repair much of the damage which we have in part caused over there.

Mr. SYMINGTON. May I say to the Senator from Vermont that the reason for my amendment has much to do with the McGee amendment which yesterday was defeated. The McGee amendment would have taken away any ceiling on the amount of money that was being requested by the administration for use in Cambodia. My amendment agrees with all the money that was requested by the administration, but says that before they spend additional money, they should come to Congress for authorization. That is the amendment that we are discussing now.

Mr. President, I am prepared to yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, first will the Senator yield to me for a question?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Mississippi on my time.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, this is largely a matter of legislative history, and I wish to ask the Senator some questions after I make a very brief statement.

This pertains, now, to the money that can be spent in Cambodia. When we had the procurement bill up, we had a similar amendment with reference to how much could be spent in Laos. We excepted the bombing in both areas, and agreed on a

October 29, 1971

Approved For Release 2002/01/10 : CIA-RDP73B00296R000400160022-7

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

S 17171

\$350 million figure, which was the budget request, and I agreed to the amendment on that basis.

The amendment would actually, though, put that as an annual ceiling, a legislative ceiling, which I thought was all right; you can hardly argue against it.

I said to the Senator from Missouri, as he related yesterday in my absence, that I would support a similar situation as to Cambodia, to take the budget figure, as we did before.

He has now amended his amendment, as I understand it, to \$341 million, which is the amount of the budget request.

We do carry the idea in the bill, though, that this is a legislative ceiling for one year.

Mr. SYMINGTON. That is correct.

Mr. STENNIS. All right. I think that is sound.

Now, there is some language in the bill that uses the word "expenditures." This is technical language that I think ought to be cleared up. It could be cleared up in conference. The question about expenditures or authorizations or commitments—I do not know what all the terms are, but what I wanted to make clear is that this amendment will have no limitations on the spending, if they see fit, of up to some \$341 million; is that correct?

Mr. SYMINGTON. That is my understanding.

Mr. STENNIS. Yes. And the Senator does not intend to limit, after agreeing to this \$341 million, in any way the expenditure of it for purposes in Cambodia?

Mr. SYMINGTON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. STENNIS. If the Senator will yield further, what is an expenditure in this field sometimes requires a definition or an understanding, and I will illustrate.

Some of these goods are used jeeps, we will say, that we would send over into Cambodia. I am just illustrating.

That is a used item, and there has to be some ground rule on how it is going to be evaluated in money figures. It is not an expenditure of new money; it is just the sending over of war material.

Does the Senator understand it that way, and would he be amenable, in conference, if this amendment passes, to having ground rules established, the ones that are used now?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I want to be careful not to say something at variance with the language of the bill.

The bill provides:

For the purpose of this subsection, "value" means the fair market value of any goods, supplies, materials, or equipment provided to, for, or on behalf of Cambodia but in no case less than 33 1/3 per centum of the amount the United States paid at the time such goods, supplies, materials, or equipment were acquired by the United States.

That sounds fair and proper to me.

Mr. STENNIS. That language indicates the principle that I am maintaining for. I am not certain about that 33 1/3 percent. I understand that is a reasonable ground rule.

Mr. SYMINGTON. There is no use in passing any legislation limiting the amount of money but then having the Defense Department or one of the ad-

ministration's adjacent departments first declare something useless and then give it away to the Cambodians. We do not want to waste time in the Senate by in effect setting a ceiling which is the amount they request then have them go millions beyond the ceiling by declaring worthless a lot of equipment they later put to use in Cambodia. I believe this clause is constructive as written in the bill.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, we are trying to make legislative history and are not particularly arguing the bill. I have tentatively agreed to this figure, but it was with the understanding that we were not going to be left in the dark as to interpretations. I think the 33 1/3 percent figure is a reasonable amount, but I do not want any unknown restrictions in this language, and the Senator does not, either.

Mr. SYMINGTON. No. That is right.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, with the understanding about this language and with what clarification may be necessary as to the word "expenditure" in conference, I can support the amendment.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time of the Senator from Missouri has expired.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Six minutes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I think this is a very inconsistent policy; this amendment rapidly escalates our expenditures in Cambodia.

The Senator from Missouri, I know, was committed to amend his amendment from \$25 million to \$341 million, because he recognized the fact of life that the influence of the Armed Services Committee is dominant in this body. But he wanted an expression of a principle, that Congress still has a slight, remote function to play in the foreign policy field. If the Senator from Missouri had offered an amount \$1 under what the Pentagon wanted, it would have the opposition of the Armed Services Committee, and the amendment would fail.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I will yield in a moment.

I will not trade on any such basis. It is not the money that is bothering me, although I think we are in bad shape and cannot afford it. It is the principle of now starting to construct an enormous military machine, using foreign bodies backed by American money and guns.

The Joint Chiefs have been very candid in the newspaper—I do not know whether they intended to be or not—but they are intending to build an army of more than 300,000 Cambodians.

I assume they are doing the same in Laos, because they have asked for a similar vast increase in Laos; and, of course, Thailand is our bastion country, into which we have poured billions of dollars and will continue to do so.

I do not know why it is not legitimate for the Senate to take the responsibility: Do we want to go down that road again?

us in the form of the Gulf of Tonkin resolution. At that time, we were misled by lies about what had happened, and our emotions were appealed to—we were told we had been attacked on the open seas in an unprovoked manner, and I and everybody else except two Members of the Senate fell for it.

There is no excuse now for a similar mistake. Our eyes are open. We know what is going on. We know the greatest tragedy and loss to this country since the civil war is going on in Asia. Why do we wish to go down this road again in Cambodia and in Laos?

We are headed in this direction because of the dominant influence of the military committee and the military establishment in this country. I know of no reason for it other than they want to do it. No good reason has been given to me as to why we want to organize and pay for an enormous army in Cambodia. I am against it.

I realize that the votes are here; and if I am the only one who votes against it, I will, because at issue is whether we are going to construct an enormous army of Cambodians. We have already approved one in Laos and, of course, Thailand has enormous amounts of money in here for the maintenance and construction of an enormous army. When I say "enormous," I am referring to the fact that it is far beyond the capacity of these little countries to support the military establishments we encourage on them. Cambodia had approximately 35,000 in her army when Sihanouk left the country. We have already built that up to 185,000, and there are reports to the effect that by 1975 or 1976 they will have 300,000. We pay all the bills. Here is a limit of \$341 million. Next year it will be \$500 million, and the next year it probably will be \$700 million. That is the road we are headed down.

If we had been attacked, or were about to be destroyed, nobody would hesitate to respond. There is that difference between Tonkin Gulf and this. There we had been told, erroneously, that we had been attacked, and we fell for it. There is no similar excuse in this case. We are deliberately undertaking obligations far beyond the needs and against the interests of Cambodia. The people of Cambodia are going to be the victims here, just as the people of Vietnam have been the victims of that situation. The people of Cambodia do not want this to happen to them. They would like us to go home and leave them alone.

Somebody said that we are not going in there. The newspapers said the other day that they have doubled the amount of military advisers in Phnompenh. The Senator from New Jersey has been trying to get a personnel limit. I support his efforts.

I just want to make my position clear. I am not arguing about \$15 million or \$20 million. I am arguing about the policy of this country in undertaking an endless operation in Southeast Asia to build up huge military forces there. I think it is against the President's announced policy of going to Peking, and I think it is against the interests of

Approved For Release 2002/01/10 : CIA-RDP73B00296R000400160022-7

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I will yield for a question.

Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I do not know when this unanimous-consent agreement was entered into, and ask unanimous consent for an additional 10 minutes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I must object, because the time was available this morning, and that is when part of the time was lost. But I would suggest that 10 minutes be taken out of the bill.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield 5 minutes from the bill to the Senator from Missouri.

Does the Senator from New Jersey wish some time?

Mr. CASE. I would like 2 minutes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, how much time do I have on the amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. One minute.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield that minute plus 5 minutes on the bill to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I would not want the Senate to misunderstand the basic purpose of this perfecting amendment.

What we want to do is establish control of the vast amounts of money being spent in the Far East. I think it fair to say Congress has lost control of the expenditure of that money. This amendment would now give the administration all the money they say they needed in Cambodia for next year; but before they spend any additional money, it will be necessary for them to come back and obtain additional authorization.

If anyone believes this amount is too much, that can be brought up when the matter comes to the Senate for appropriation approval, or, prior to that, for same when it comes before the Appropriations Committee.

In my opinion the Chairman of the Committee on Armed Services has been quite fair with respect to this proposed legislation. It is probable that we would not be able to adopt this amendment if he had not agreed we should establish control if the administration wants additional money.

Therefore, and with the premise that we will have a chance to get into this matter at the time the Senate approves appropriations, I will vote for the perfecting amendment which I have sent to the desk.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from New Jersey.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, although I have worked with the Senator from Missouri on this amendment, on which we are cosponsors, and I fully respect his honor in fulfilling the commitment to those who he assured would be given a chance to vote. Approved for Release 2002/06/10 : CIA-RDP80-0296000400160022-7

made no such commitment. I fully support the action of the committee on this particular matter which is to support adoption of the Symington committee amendment for the \$250 million ceiling for the fiscal year and a 200 personnel limitation in the same amendment. The \$250 million represents roughly the current rate of American assistance. On the same premise as that just now urged by the Senator from Missouri, I urge that we keep it at the present rate while we are considering the whole question of our obligation and the depth of our commitment in this new area. It has only been a year and a half since we have gotten into this particular situation. We got into it without congressional approval, wholly on the basis of the discretionary funds used by the administration. It was later approved, it is true, when we considered the supplemental appropriation bill last year, but it was approved on the basis of a much smaller amount than this year, an amount adequate to take care of the current level operation which I think is, if anything, excessive—\$250 million. However, it should remain the same and I urge the Senate to turn down this proposed increase of \$91 million in this area.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Byrd of Virginia). All time has now expired.

Mr. GRAVEL. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk in the nature of a substitute to the pending amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 44, lines 13 and 14, strike out the words "in excess of \$150 million."

On page 44, beginning with "In" on line 20, strike out everything down through and including "any" on line 23, and insert in lieu thereof "No".

On page 44, line 24, insert immediately after "equipment" the words "shall be".

On page 44, line 25, strike out "such" and insert immediately after "year" the date "1972".

On page 45, strike out everything on lines 1 through 6 and everything on lines 16 through 19.

On pages 45 and 46 redesignate paragraphs (e), (f), and (g) as paragraphs (d), (e), and (f), respectively.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Byrd of Virginia). The Chair will say that the amendment offered by the Senator from Alaska is not in order, that it is not a valid substitute, and does not amend the same place in the bill as the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. GRAVEL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum for a brief moment—I withdraw that request, Mr. President.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes on the bill to clarify the situation.

Mr. President, I was told by the Senator from Alaska that all he wished to do was to change the amount in the amendment of the Senator from Missouri from the \$341 million to \$150 million. It is as simple as that. So that I do not understand why it is not in order. It was sent to the desk. That is the way it was told to me, that the Senator from Alaska was to change the amount in the amendment of the

Senator from Missouri from \$341 to \$150 million. The Senator from Alaska has a right to do that, and, of course, from my point of view, I shall support it because I do not approve of an increase in the amount as offered in the amendment of the Senator from Missouri.

The Senator from Alaska told me what he wanted to do, that he wanted to change the amount to \$150 million. I do not understand why it is not in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Byrd of Virginia). The Chair will say that the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri affects two places in the bill. The amendment offered by the Senator from Alaska affects five different places, including a different page of the bill.

Mr. GRAVEL. Mr. President, I have sent another copy of a perfecting amendment to the desk which I would ask the Parliamentarian to rule on its acceptability to the amendment of the Senator from Missouri.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the perfecting amendment.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 44, lines 13 and 14, strike out the words "in excess of \$250 million" and insert "\$150 million."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is in order.

Who yields time?

Mr. GRAVEL. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much times does the Senator require?

Mr. GRAVEL. As much time as I may need to make my introductory remarks, and then I will be happy to yield to other Senators who may wish to address themselves to this same issue.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska may proceed.

Mr. GRAVEL. Mr. President, my original amendment was to eliminate all money for Cambodia. This is not new. I offered a similar one last year, along with several of my colleagues; but we were not successful last year.

I am totally distressed over the fact that this body chooses to escalate our involvement—and I use the word "escalate" because I have heard it mentioned here that we are treading water and keeping the same commitment we had last year. That is not the case. Members should be on notice that we are escalating, that we are not treading water.

It seems unlikely that we could garner enough support from the membership to secure passage of my original amendment, so at the request of the Senator from Arkansas I am happy to modify my amendment to leave out the bombing provision and to permit a modicum amount for cleanup operations. We could try at least to rehabilitate the country and leave it in a semblance of the state in which we found it. That is the reason I have gone along with the \$150 million. The \$150 million is still treading water, but not the \$250 million.

As I recall the incidents last year, we went into Cambodia on a unilateral decision, without the permission of Congress, and spent money to the tune of \$100 million, taking that money from aid that would have gone to other countries.

October 29, 1971

Approved For Release 2002/04/10 : CIA-RDP73B00296R000400160022-7

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD - SENATE

S 17173

What came before this body last December was a piece of legislation to put back the money the President had spent unilaterally, robbing various aid programs to do so. The amount was first \$100 million. Then the request was for \$150 million; so, thus far, what has been spent in Cambodia, in excess of 1 year, has been \$250 million.

What was agreed to, before the fact, was \$150 million. Now we are asked to agree, before the fact, to \$250 million.

If that is not escalation, then obviously—

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, if the Senator from Alaska will yield on that point, the Senator from Missouri's perfecting amendment makes it \$341 million. Actually, the \$250 million is what the committee bill provides and then yesterday the McGee amendment was suggested and voted down, which would have lifted any ceiling at all. The Senator from Missouri, as he has stated, had the understanding of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. STENNIS) that we would change this amount today to \$341 million. The Senator from Alaska would be cutting the \$341 million back to \$150 million.

Mr. GRAVEL. That is right.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The issue is simple: Do we want to increase the amount of money to Cambodia to build up a large army, which we will have to support, or do we wish to stabilize at a lower level?

These amounts are simply a symbol of a policy. I would hope the Senate would not go on record as saying it is in favor of, in effect, of letting the administration do whatever it deems proper in Cambodia and in Laos. I do not understand how this can be interpreted as a restraint. It is for 1 year. Next year they will say, "We want \$550 million." And the year after they will want \$800 million, and we will have to have a ceiling of \$800 million.

The Senator from Alaska is trying to cut back by about \$200 million, when judged against the \$341 million being offered by the Senator from Missouri. I think that is a very simple proposition. The substitute amendment of the Senator from Alaska draws attention not only to money, but also to policy.

Mr. GRAVEL. Mr. President, I ask that the amendment be modified as identified by the Parliamentarian.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is accordingly modified.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GRAVEL. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, again I hope that the Senate does not get the wrong impression about the basic thrust of the position some of us are taking on this measure. It did not make any real difference what the figure is that was approved by the Foreign Relations Committee or passed by the Senate in the past, the administration has spent the money the way they wanted and to the amount they desired. Let me repeat, the basic thrust of this amendment is to get some control.

One time a man told his attorney, "When I die, I will leave my wife \$1 million."

His lawyer said "You haven't \$1 million."

The man said, "I know, but it will look great in the papers."

That is the type and character of operation we have been conducting around here. It has been going on for years. It ought to stop. Our limitations of money may have looked great in the papers, but at times they have no practical meaning.

Whatever the Congress authorizes is all of the money that should be spent by the administration.

For those who think that this is too much money—and I am one of them—there will be a full chance to analyze the matter in coming days and weeks as to how much should be reduced.

Mr. GRAVEL. Mr. President, I would hope that the Senator would join me in my amendment. If he feels that the money being spent is too much, let us say that it is too much and not go any further.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, the Senator and I have discussed this matter. He has come in with a heavy reduction. If we get control, later we can determine the amount of money. Without control, we are talking to the winds.

Mr. GRAVEL. How would that give us control? If we say \$500 million, what will stop them from spending \$500 million?

Mr. SYMINGTON. The Senator apparently has not read the amendment, or the bill as it came from the Foreign Relations Committee.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, would the Senator yield me 5 minutes of his time so that I might discuss the matter?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I had asked the distinguished ranking minority member of the committee to yield me 3 minutes for the same purpose.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I would be glad to yield time to the Senator from Montana. However, first I would like to clear up any misunderstanding that may exist. The State Department is in favor of the Symington proposal to increase funds to \$341 million. I am sure of that.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, would the Senator from Vermont yield me 5 minutes after he has yielded time to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. AIKEN. Yes. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Montana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, when President Nixon recognized the government of Prince Norodom Sihanouk, he dispatched two men to the embassy—it was not a legation at the time—to represent us. In the interim, when Sihanouk was overthrown, there were nine members of our military—I do not believe they were attached to the military mission in Phnom Penh. Today there are in excess of 150 civilian and military personnel, with the military in the preponderance.

Not so many days ago, there appeared in the public prints an outline of a 5-year aid plan for Cambodia, I think estimating in 1975 or 1976 an increase in the military from \$35,000 at the time

lieve \$700,000, which is a higher figure than mentioned by the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, and at the same time increasing the cost of the participation to us.

I did not vote for the Case-Symington amendment in committee. I have not voted for an amendment on the floor, that I recall. And the reason I have not voted, and will not vote, for either the Gravel amendment, the substitute, or the Symington amendment, is because to do so in my opinion would be to place a stamp of approval on our participation in what we are doing in Cambodia not only now, but also in the years ahead if the programed outline bears any semblance to the truth. That I will not join in doing.

So, I want the RECORD to be clear. If it were a clearcut, outright doing away with all funds, I would vote for it. However, to me \$150 million is just the same as \$341 million.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, the Senator and I have discussed this problem. This is the problem we had also in the Laotian amendment. We settled that, and I think we will get it sustained in conference.

This is almost identical. Let us move back a little. About 15 months ago we were fighting in Cambodia. Our men were fighting there and were getting killed. The President of the United States ordered them in there. No one except a foolish man—and he is certainly not a foolish man—would have sent our men there if he thought it was not necessary in order to maintain our position and protect our men.

This is altogether a different policy. Our men are out of there now. Whoever the men are that are fighting there, they are not our boys. However, this country is in jeopardy. They are having to fight for their lives. It is still a question of whether they will be able to survive.

So, what is this aid? Here it is broken down. We have a breakdown of these other countries.

This will be an absolute control. They cannot spend more.

Of the \$341 million, \$240 million is for military assistance. About two-thirds of it goes for ammunition and spare parts and about one-third of it goes for various other equipment.

My guess is that about half of that equipment, at least, is secondhand equipment, something that we have already used. It is valued according to the formula to which the Senator referred.

The next item is economic aid, \$110 million. That is an item in this amendment. That is big AID, \$10 million, economic aid. There is no military and no Department of Defense. The Senator from Arkansas gets excited about that sometimes.

This is a program that comes from the Foreign Relations Committee. Public Law 480, food for peace, \$20 million.

Excess defense articles, that is some \$11 million.

Approved For Release 2002/04/10 : CIA-RDP73B00296R000400160022-7

October 29, 1971

The total is \$341 million. That is the estimate of about what would be needed.

I have already explained about the ammunition and the spare parts. I think at this stage we have no valid choice except to affirm these figures, as the Senator from Missouri who is well versed in this matter has proposed, and we will let this matter ride on with an actual ceiling on it. They cannot spend any more than that and in that way we have established legislative control on how much will be spent in this country for all purposes, including this used military equipment. So it is on that basis we are trying to get this as a practical matter. I commend the Senator for his willingness to settle this on a reasonable, practical basis. We follow next year from this starting point and we will have control on it.

Mr. President, I hope the amendment of the Senator from Alaska is rejected and that the amendment of the Senator from Missouri is agreed to.

Mr. GRAVEL. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. GRAVEL. Mr. President, how much time remains on each side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. GRAVEL. How much time is remaining to the Senator from Arkansas?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas has 5 minutes remaining.

Who yields time?

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee has made the case very well. However, I cannot allow the Record to stand with out answering a remark made by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations to the effect that assistance for Cambodia in line with the budget request would actually go against the policy of the administration or the President.

The President's policy is to withdraw American troops as rapidly as practicable from that part of the world. His policy is that U.S. troops should not be used to defend every threatened country; his policy is to encourage such other countries to bear the primary responsibility for defending themselves.

But the Nixon doctrine does not mean that we have abandoned all our friends in the world or that we have abandoned all non-Communist nations that want to resist aggression. There are two main parts of the doctrine. One important part is that we will help our friends defend themselves.

There is no question that what is going on in Cambodia is not a civil war. There has been some argument about whether the war in South Vietnam is a civil war. In Cambodia it is out and out aggression by North Vietnam. In Cambodia the Cambodians want to defend themselves and they are defending themselves. Our policy is to help them, but without providing any of our troops to do the fighting.

The distinguished chairman of the

Committee on Foreign Relations has pointed to the fact that there may be some relaxation of tensions, attributable in part to the President's forthcoming visit to Moscow and Peking, and he has referred to the fact that the situation is better in South Vietnam. The situation is better in South Vietnam, but the situation is better, because we helped the South Vietnamese build up an army capable of defending itself while we have been withdrawing. The situation has not improved, because of any change in attitude on the part of the North Vietnamese.

If we help the Cambodians defend themselves, we are acting in our own interest, particularly if we recall that we have some treaty obligations to such countries as Thailand.

The distinguished majority leader spoke in terms of Sihanouk being "overthrown." I do not know what he means by the word "overthrown," but I am sure he did not mean to leave the impression that Sihanouk was not replaced in the regular manner. In fact, Lon Nol was put in power in the same way that Sihanouk came to power, and as I understand it, the very people Sihanouk appointed replaced Sihanouk and put Lon Nol in. That does not mean that I necessarily agree with the form or composition of the government there as now constituted. But that is really not the question.

Mr. President, I urge that the Gravel amendment be rejected and that the Symington amendment be approved.

Mr. BROOKE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alaska yield for a question?

Mr. GRAVEL. I have only a few minutes remaining. Will the Senator from Arkansas yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont is yielding time on the bill.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, how much time do we have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are 2 minutes remaining to the Senator from Arkansas who has the opposition time on the amendment, and 3 minutes remaining to the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Does the Senator from Massachusetts wish me to yield 2 minutes?

Mr. BROOKE. Yes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Massachusetts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts is recognized.

Mr. BROOKE. I wish to ask if the Senator from Alaska broke down the amount of money into items he would recover by the \$150 million he proposes to reduce it to?

Mr. GRAVEL. No, I have no breakdown.

Mr. BROOKE. The Senator cut the total sum and it is not broken down, as the Senator from Mississippi indicated.

Mr. GRAVEL. No.

Mr. BROOKE. It puts a ceiling on the total amount and reduces it to \$150 million without regard to how it shall be

Mr. GRAVEL. That is correct. I want to emphasize that the word "ceiling" in my opinion is a misnomer.

Mr. BROOKE. I am sorry. I did not understand the Senator.

Mr. GRAVEL. It is a misnomer. I do not think it will work. I have not seen any ceiling in this body work.

If this body had some of the sharing of responsibility we talk about we could end this cottonpicking war. The inference was made that the invasion was by North Vietnam. The invasion of Cambodia took place by this country. I hope that would be made clear.

When we hear a government that talks of sterile democracy which it is going to put aside, and we see a program by this administration to escalate, let us go over the arithmetic again.

Last year the President, when we unilaterally invaded Cambodia, submitted a figure of \$100 million and all we did was approve it. Along with that request, to pay back Peter who had been robbed by Paul, was another \$150 million that was approved by this body. Now, we are asked by the administration, by the committee, for \$250 million, which is an escalation of \$100 million more than we approved last year, and we are asked to go to \$300 million carte blanche.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GRAVEL. I yield.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I intend to support the Senator on this amendment, but I protest against the suggestion that what we are doing here is an exercise in futility. For the first time this will put an absolute ceiling, not on appropriations but on spending. For all purposes it overrides all provisions for discretionary authority, transfers, or anything else; and I do not want any legislative history to be on the books which would give the chance for any executive agency to say this was not intended to be an absolute ceiling on spending of all kinds.

Mr. GRAVEL. My colleague has been here much longer than I, and I would defer to his judgment, but I have been disillusioned in my tenure here.

Mr. CASE. Of course, but we have done this before and in supporting the Senator's amendment I want to be very clear that we are not intending in any way to leave any of those loopholes which have existed still in effect.

Mr. GRAVEL. I realize that is the good faith of my colleague.

Mr. CASE. Not only good faith, but action by this body. We are not intending to leave any discretionary authority to transfer from one fund to another or anything of that sort, and I hope the Senator will not leave the suggestion that he intends it.

Mr. GRAVEL. No, not the slightest. I endorse my colleague's statement 110 percent.

I have found as we close loopholes, down the street they open them just as fast. They prosecute the war regardless of what we say, regardless of demonstrated facts on our part.

I hope this will be a firm reduction and that my amendment will be agreed to, and I would do what Members of

October 29, 1971

Approved For Release 2002/01/10 : CIA-RDP73B00296R000400160022-7

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

S 17175

the Senate have said they want done: Tread water. But to increase beyond \$150 million is not treading water, and every one should understand it is an escalation of our activity in Cambodia.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GRAVEL. I yield.

Mr. CASE. The point of my protest before about use of the suggestion that this is just an idle gesture, is given special support by this newspaper report which said that the Joint Chiefs of Staff had proposed four ways to get around any ceiling over spending—or any limitation, rather, not a ceiling on spending—which is what we are doing—but to get around any limitation on authorization in this bill. It is for that reason that it is terribly important that we not only have a limitation on authorizations, which we have, but this ceiling, which would be on the spending.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GRAVEL. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired on the amendment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute on the bill.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I have no doubt about it. This is an actual ceiling. This is a limitation on expenditures. It was our committee which dug in and dug out to get the figures and required the report. We know what the expenditures are going to be. We know what the program is. We know what are the used goods and the evaluations put on them. Have no doubt about it—this is an actual ceiling and an actual limitation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the perfecting amendment of the Senator from Alaska to the amendment of the Senator from Missouri. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.
Mr. MANSFIELD (after having voted in the negative). Mr. President, on this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. ELLENDER). If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." Therefore, I withdraw my vote.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I announce that the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. ELLENDER), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. GAMBRELL), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. HARRIS), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. HARTKE), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUE), the Senator from Washington (Mr. JACKSON), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. MCGEE), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. MCGOVERN), and the Senator from Maine (Mr. MUSKIE) are necessarily absent.

I further announce that if present and voting, the Senator from Washington (Mr. JACKSON) would vote "nay."

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY) and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. MCGOVERN) would vote "yea."

Mr. GRIFFIN. I announce that the Senators from Nebraska (Mr. CURTIS and Mr. HRUSKA), the Senator from

(Mr. JORDAN), the Senator from Iowa (Mr. MILLER), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. TAFT), and the Senator from Texas (Mr. TOWER) are necessarily absent.

The Senator from South Dakota (Mr. MUNDT) is absent because of illness.

The Senator from South Carolina (Mr. THURMOND) is absent on official business.

The Senator from Vermont (Mr. STAFFORD), and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. WEICKER) are detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senators from Nebraska (Mr. CURTIS and Mr. HRUSKA), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. STAFFORD), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. TAFT), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. THURMOND), and the Senator from Texas (Mr. TOWER) would each vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 26, nays 53, as follows:

[No. 279 Leg.]

YEAS—26

Bayh
Brooke
Burdick
Byrd, W. Va.
Case
Church
Cotton
Cranston
Fulbright

Gravel
Hart
Hatfield
Hughes
Mathias
Metcalfe
Mondale
Montoya
Moss

Nelson
Pell
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Schweiker
Tunney
Williams

NAYS—53

Aiken
Allen
Allott
Anderson
Baker
Beall
Bellmon
Bennett
Bentsen
Bible
Boggs
Brock
Buckley
Byrd, Va.
Cannon
Chiles
Cook
Cooper

Dole
Dominick
Eagleton
Eastland
Ervin
Fannin
Fong
Goldwater
Griffin
Gurney
Hansen
Hollings
Humphrey
Javite
Jordan, N.C.
Long
Magnuson
McClellan

McIntyre
Packwood
Pastore
Pearson
Percy
Roth
Saxbe
Scott
Smith
Sparkman
Spong
Stennis
Stevenson
Symington
Talmadge
Young

PRESENT AND GIVING A LIVE PAIR, AS PREVIOUSLY RECORDED—1

Mansfield, against.

NOT VOTING—20

Curtis
Ellender
Gambrell
Harris
Hartke
Hruska
Inouye

Jackson
Jordan, Idaho
Kennedy
McGee
McGovern
Miller
Mundt

Muskie
Stafford
Taft
Thurmond
Tower
Weicker

So Mr. GRAVEL's amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri. All time on the amendment has expired. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. PASTORE (after having voted in the affirmative). On this vote I have a live pair with the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. ELLENDER). If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." I have already voted "yea." I therefore withdraw my vote, as an accommodation to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I announce that the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. ELLENDER), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. GAMBRELL), the Senator

from Indiana (Mr. HARTKE), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUE), the Senator from Washington (Mr. JACKSON), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. MCGEE), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. MCGOVERN), and the Senator from Maine (Mr. MUSKIE) are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Washington (Mr. JACKSON) would vote "yea."

I further announce that if present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY) would vote "nay."

Mr. GRIFFIN. I announce that the Senators from Nebraska (Mr. CURTIS and Mr. HRUSKA), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. JORDAN), the Senator from Iowa (Mr. MILLER), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. TAFT), and the Senator from Texas (Mr. TOWER) are necessarily absent.

The Senator from South Dakota (Mr. MUNDT) is absent because of illness.

The Senator from South Carolina (Mr. THURMOND) is absent on official business.

If present and voting, the Senators from Nebraska (Mr. CURTIS and Mr. HRUSKA), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. TAFT), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. THURMOND), and the Senator from Texas (Mr. TOWER) would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 45, nays 36, as follows:

[No. 280 Leg.]

YEAS—45

Aiken
Allott
Baker
Beall
Bellmon
Bennett
Bentsen
Bible
Boggs
Brock
Buckley
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Cook

Dole
Dominick
Eastland
Fannin
Fong
Goldwater
Griffin
Gurney
Hansen
Hollings
Long
Magnuson
McIntyre
Packwood
Pearson

Percy
Randolph
Roth
Saxbe
Scott
Smith
Sparkman
Spong
Stafford
Stennis
Stevens
Symington
Talmadge
Tunney
Young

NAYS—36

Allen
Anderson
Bayh
Brooke
Burdick
Case
Chiles
Church
Cooper
Cotton
Cranston
Eagleton

Ervin
Fulbright
Gravel
Hart
Hughes
Humphrey
Javite
Jordan, N.C.
Mansfield
Mathias
McClellan

Metcalfe
Mondale
Montoya
Moss
Nelson
Pell
Proxmire
Ribicoff
Schweiker
Stevenson
Weicker
Williams

PRESENT AND GIVING A LIVE PAIR, AS PREVIOUSLY RECORDED—1

Pastore, for.

NOT VOTING—18

Curtis
Ellender
Gambrell
Harris
Hartke
Hruska

Inouye
Jackson
Jordan, Idaho
Kennedy
McGee
McGovern

Miller
Mundt
Muskie
Taft
Thurmond
Tower

So Mr. SYMINGTON's amendment was agreed to.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the amendment was agreed to be reconsidered.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was

Approved For Release 2002/01/10 : CIA-RDP73B00296R000400160022-7

The result was announced—yeas 28, nays 52, as follows:

[No. 282 Leg.]

YEAS—28

Allen	Cook	Jordan, N.C.
Allott	Dole	Jordan, Idaho
Baker	Dominick	McClellan
Bennett	Eastland	Smith
Bible	Ervin	Stennis
Brock	Fannin	Stevens
Buckley	Fong	Talmadge
Byrd, Va.	Gurney	Young
Byrd, W. Va.	Hansen	
Cannon	Hollings	

NAYS—52

Alken	Hatfield	Percy
Anderson	Humphrey	Proxmire
Bayh	Javits	Randolph
Beall	Kennedy	Ribicoff
Bellmon	Long	Roth
Bentsen	Magnuson	Saxbe
Boggs	Mansfield	Schweiker
Brooke	Mathias	Scott
Burdick	McIntyre	Sparkman
Caso	Metcalf	Spong
Chiles	Mondale	Stafford
Church	Montoya	Stevenson
Cooper	Moss	Symington
Cranston	Nelson	Taft
Fulbright	Packwood	Weicker
Griffin	Pastore	Williams
Harris	Pearson	
Hart	Pell	

NOT VOTING—20

Cotton	Hartke	Miller
Curtis	Hruska	Mundt
Eagleton	Hughes	Muskie
Ellender	Inouye	Thurmond
Gambrell	Jackson	Tower
Goldwater	McGee	Tunney
Gravel	McGovern	

So Mr. DOMINICK's amendment was rejected.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. PASTORE. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 32, line 11, strike out "\$565,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$452,000,000".

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, may we have order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, in order to accommodate three Senators, the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. CASE), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. FULBRIGHT), and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. STENNIS), I have agreed to yield briefly, with the consent of the Senate, provided I do not lose my right to the floor.

[Disturbance in the galleries.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Galleries will be in order. The Sergeant at Arms will see that order in the galleries is restored.

The Chair recognizes the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, may we have order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

The Senator from New Jersey may proceed.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, as I have understood, now, the Senator proposes that in section 513 on page 34 of the bill, the words "South Vietnam, Cambodia, and Burma" be stricken out of lines 13 and 14, as they appear.

Mr. CASE. That is right.

Mr. STENNIS. That would leave, of course, then, the words "Laos, North Vietnam, and Thailand," as they appear now in the bill.

Mr. President, the Senator from New Jersey has correctly stated the understanding that we have had about this legislation, and we have agreed, for the purpose of this legislative step, that this modification of section 513 will put the section where it may stay in the bill in that form, and we can move forward with the bill without any further amendment being filed or brought up by the Senator from Mississippi.

I do make the point, as the Senator has implied, that this is done without prejudice to a full consideration of the matter in conference, based on the facts as they may exist at that time.

Is that the Senator's understanding?

Mr. CASE. The Senator has stated correctly what his position is, and the basis on which his agreement not to oppose this amendment or to offer another amendment to this section is based.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator, and I wish to make this further explanation: I think leaving the word "Laos" in here—

Mr. CASE. That is another section.

Mr. STENNIS. I beg the Senator's pardon?

Mr. CASE. I thought the Senator was talking about another section.

Mr. STENNIS. No, I am talking about the same section. I think that leaving the word "Laos" in the bill as now written is perhaps a contradiction of a provision on the same subject in the military procurement bill we passed 2½ weeks ago. However, I think that to get all the real facts on this matter before the Senate now would require a closed session. There is hardly time for that now, and I do not think there is any mood for it, either. So, as an original proposition, and without prejudice, we agreed to let this matter go as has already been outlined, and then in conference there will be a chance to really consider and discuss any facts that might be relevant; and I would rest on the decision that is made by the conferees.

Under those circumstances, I hope that the modification will be acceptable to the Senate. I have talked with some Senators about supporting my position in this matter, and I now withdraw the request because I believe this meets the situation.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I yield to the chairman, if he wishes to make comment.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am in full agreement with that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me 1 minute?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. I want the record to show that I consider this an important amendment, and I am free to follow it

up, as is the Senator from New Jersey, of course, or anyone else—the chairman of the committee or anyone else—and get the facts together and get it before the conference.

Mr. CASE. The situation is that the matter will be in conference, because the House bill does not contain any provision on this subject.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time on the amendment has been yielded back. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New Jersey.

• The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CHURCH addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho, by unanimous consent, yielded to three Senators in order, the first of those Senators being the Senator from New Jersey.

• Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, under the agreement, I send an amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows: On page 34, line 4, strike out the words "Laos, or South Vietnam."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be in order.

Who yields time?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. President, this is exactly the same circumstance as the previous one, by agreement with the Senator from Mississippi. We have discussed this matter. This involves the return to the Committee on Foreign Relations of jurisdiction over military assistance to Laos, South Vietnam and Thailand.

We have agreed to strike out South Vietnam and Laos but to retain Thailand. The Senator from Mississippi does not disagree, I may say, with the return ultimately of the jurisdiction over Laos and South Vietnam, but he thinks it is premature to put it in this bill at this time. Therefore, by mutual agreement, I have agreed to this modification.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, the Senator from Arkansas has correctly stated the matter. Thailand is left in the bill; and military assistance hereafter, if this becomes law, will be handled by the Committee on Foreign Relations. I am willing that, in the future, jurisdiction with respect to Southeast Asia be returned to the Committee on Foreign Relations. I think that while we are there and our men are there and the activities are going on, we ought to keep it where it is, because they have to be considered together. I appreciate the Senator's position.

With that, I am satisfied with the section as modified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who is

acting for the minority leader? Does the minority leader yield back the remainder of his time on this amendment?

Mr. GRIFFIN. I yield back the remainder of the time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time on the amendment has been yielded back. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas.

• The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I have a technical amendment that does not affect the bill at all, except to clear up a typographical error.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 20, line 18, after "1969," insert the following: "\$350,000,000 for the fiscal year 1970, and".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is in order. Who yields time?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. President, this has no effect upon the bill at all. It is a mistake, a typographical error, on the part of the staff in preparing the bill. They did not make many errors, but this is a hard bill to keep straight. This amendment has no effect on anything substantive in the bill. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I yield back the time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time on the amendment has been yielded back. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas.

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 548

• Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment on which we have agreed. I do not think it will take more than a minute or minute and a half.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I have no objection, on the basis of the same qualification.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 57, line 7, after the word "responsibilities" insert the following words: "within the jurisdiction of these committees", and on line 11, after the word "information" insert the following words: "within the jurisdiction of these committees".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is in order. Who yields time?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. President, this is another amendment on which we worked out an agreement with the Senator from Arkansas. It relates to reports being made by the Department of State to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and we are in favor of that. The language was so broad, however, that we thought it would include some items over which the Committee on Armed Services has primary jurisdiction. These words merely correct and clarify that point, and I hope the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I wish the Record to show that that is exactly what we agreed. There was no

intention of the committee to usurp any jurisdiction of the Armed Services Committee. This amendment clarifies the intention of the committee.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. STENNIS. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time on the amendment has been yielded back. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Mississippi.

• The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In accordance with the previous order, the Chair recognizes the Senator from Utah (Mr. Moss).

ESTABLISHMENT OF ARCHES NATIONAL PARK, UTAH

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives on S. 30.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ALLEN) laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 30) to establish the Arches National Park in the State of Utah, which was to strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert:

That (a) subject to valid existing rights, the lands, waters, and interests therein within the boundary generally depicted on the map entitled "Boundary Map, Proposed Arches National Park, Utah," numbered RPSSC-138-20, 001E and dated September 1969, are hereby established as the Arches National Park, hereinafter referred to as the "park". Such map shall be on file and available for public inspection in the offices of the National Park Service, Department of the Interior.

(b) The Arches National Monument is hereby abolished, and any funds available for purposes of the monument shall be available for purposes of the park. Federal lands, waters, and interests therein excluded from the monument by this Act shall be administered by the Secretary of the Interior (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") in accordance with the laws applicable to the public lands of the United States.

SEC. 2. The Secretary is authorized to acquire by donation, purchase with donated or appropriated funds, transfer from any Federal agency, exchange or otherwise, the lands and interests in lands described in the first section of this Act, except that lands or interests therein owned by the State of Utah, or any political subdivision thereof, may be acquired only with the approval of such State or political subdivision.

SEC. 3. Where any Federal lands included within the park are legally occupied or utilized on the date of approval of this Act for grazing purposes, pursuant to a lease, permit, or license for a fixed term of years issued or authorized by any department, establishment, or agency of the United States, the Secretary of the Interior shall permit the persons holding such grazing privileges or their heirs to continue in the exercise thereof during the term of the lease, permit, or license, and one period of renewal thereafter.

SEC. 4. Nothing in this Act shall be construed as affecting in any way any rights of owners and operators of cattle and sheep herds, existing on the date immediately prior to the enactment of this Act, to trail their herds on traditional courses used by them prior to such date of enactment, and to water their stock, notwithstanding the fact that the lands involving such trails and watering

U.S. Aid Revived As 2 Bills

Senate Panel Cuts Amount By \$1.2 Billion

By Spencer Rich

Washington Post Staff Writer

The Senate Foreign Relations Committee voted unanimously yesterday to revive foreign aid, but only after splitting it into two separate economic and military assistance bills, and slashing more than \$1.2 billion from President Nixon's \$3.6 billion request for this year.

The two bills, totalling \$2.329 billion in authorizations, are intended as an "interim" substitute for the \$2.9 billion measure rejected by the Senate Friday by a 41 to 27 vote.

White House Press Secretary Ronald L. Ziegler told reporters immediately after the committee action, "We are not satisfied with that level. It is not sufficient to meet the essential elements of the President's policy." He added, "You may quote the President" that the \$2.329 billion figure "is insufficient."

Senate Minority Leader Hugh Scott (R-Pa.) told reporters that he believed the committee had reported out the best bills it could, given the deep disagreements within it over the aid program.

But he said he would offer floor amendments to raise the total, although not all the way to \$2.9 billion again, because that would simply risk another rejection of the program by the Senate. He Approved believed he could count on

enough vote switches to pass the two measures if their total added up to somewhere between \$2.329 billion and \$2.9 billion.

The two bills reported out yesterday:

- A \$1.144 billion economic and humanitarian aid authorization. This includes \$250 million for development loans, \$175 million for technical assistance, \$225 million for the Alliance for Progress, \$250 million for Pakistan refugee relief and \$139 million for the United Nations.

- A \$1.185 billion military aid authorization, which includes \$350 million for military aid grants, \$435 million for war-related economic supporting assistance (of which \$85 million is earmarked for Israel) and \$400 million for foreign military credit sales (with \$300 million in arms credit authority earmarked for Israel). The biggest cuts were in this area.

An unusual feature of committee voting was the use by Scott of a proxy from Karl E. Mundt (R-S.D.), who has been absent from the Senate for two years because of illness and has never appeared on the floor during that period. Mundt's proxy was decisive in an 8-to-7 committee vote to package humanitarian and economic aid together, instead of leaving them separate and having a total of three bills.

The military bill contains a \$341 million ceiling on aid to Cambodia, which the administration has now said it will accept, after threatening a veto of the earlier aid measure over an identical provision. Although it is only seeking \$341 million in funds for Cambodia aid, it had opposed a ceiling in case it wanted to switch more for emergency reasons.

State Department spokesman Charles Bray said yesterday, in the first such assurance yet given by the administration, that Cambodia aid programs "have come close to their peak and will be declining." The \$341 million ceiling was designed to head off a suspected increase.

Other important provisions approved by the committee operations in Cambodia: require annual authorization for basic State Department ex-

penses; bar use of U.S. funds for outside mercenaries to fight in North Vietnam, Thailand or Laos (thus wiping out a CIA program of financing Thai "volunteers" in Northern Laos). Senate Majority Leader Mike Mansfield's end-the-war six-months amendment also is in the bill.

Despite committee approval, the aid program still faces serious obstacles. Foreign Relations Committee Chairman J. W. Fulbright (D-Ark.) and some other former aid supporters who voted against the bill on the floor last Friday still have serious reservations about the use of military assistance as a tool to "bribe" potential allies and still fear that aid to Cambodia may lead to deeper U.S. involvement and a long-term financial drain.

Traditional foes of high foreign spending may not be fully assuaged by the committee's big slashes.

In the House, which has already passed a \$3.4 billion authorization bill, the whole issue will have to come to the floor again. Foreign Affairs Committee Chairman Thomas E. Morgan (D-Pa.) said yesterday it will be hard to get both bills through the House separately, since economic aid has always piggybacked to passage on the shoulders of military aid.

Even if the authorizations pass both chambers the program could face new cuts in the appropriations committees. Senate Appropriations Committee Chairman Allan J. Ellender (D-La.) said yesterday he couldn't envision his committee voting out more than \$2 billion to \$2.2 billion in actual appropriations.

Before taking final action yesterday, the committee defeated, 10 to 6, a proposal by Sens. Jacob K. Javits (R-N.Y.), Clifford P. Case (R-N.J.) and John Sherman Cooper (R-Ky.) to approve a flat \$2.4 billion in a single bill, and include language barring any funds in the bill from being used for Cambodia and Laos except for the purpose of assisting in withdrawal of U.S. forces from Indochina.

He declined to link the bill's defeat to any possible slowdown of U.S. withdrawal from Vietnam, but in emphasizing the need for military aid to U.S. allies, said the U.S. Navy would have to pull out of the Mediterranean without the support of Greece and Turkey.

Javits told reporters before the meeting that he would seek a \$2.9 billion authorization, but Case said the three shaved the figure to \$2.4 billion when it became clear that the higher figure had no chance.

Fulbright and the bulk of Committee Democrats opposed the Javits-Case-Cooper proposal because they favored a three-bill approach — seeking to have each of the separate portions of the program fly on its own — and a lower total figure, \$2.065 billion.

The committee first voted 9 to 7 for a three-bill system, then voted 8 to 7 to join economic and humanitarian aid. It went down each separate item in the two final bills, and Republicans won enough increases to push the final two-bill total to \$2.329 billion. Scott

said he favored a single package for fear military or economic aid portions might be defeated if sent to the floor alone, in a three-bill system.

Deputy Secretary of Defense David Packard, in a statement yesterday, blasted defeat of the earlier bill, saying (in a reference to Fulbright) that he hoped it didn't indicate a

desire to return to "Fortress Arkansas."

He declined to link the bill's defeat to any possible slowdown of U.S. withdrawal from Vietnam, but in emphasizing the need for military aid to U.S. allies, said the U.S. Navy would have to pull out of the Mediterranean without the support of Greece and Turkey.